

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

**Elvin Clifford Watkins,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**Charles Morrison, (Doctor P.A.) Kelly,**

Defendants.

**No. CIV 08-207-FHS**

**OPINION AND ORDER**  
**DENYING RENEWED MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL**

Plaintiff has filed a renewed motion requesting the court to appoint counsel [Docket No. 33] He bears the burden of convincing the court that his claim has sufficient merit to warrant appointment of counsel. McCarthy v. Weinberg, 753 F.2d 836, 838 (10th Cir. 1985) (citing United States v. Masters, 484 F.2d 1251, 1253 (10th Cir. 1973)). The court has carefully reviewed the merits of plaintiff's claims, the nature of factual issues raised in his allegations, and his ability to investigate crucial facts. McCarthy, 753 F.2d at 838 (citing Maclin v. Freake, 650 F.2d 885, 887-88 (7th Cir. 1981)). After considering plaintiff's ability to present his claims and the complexity of the legal issues raised by the claims, the court finds that appointment of counsel is not warranted. *See* Williams v. Meese, 926 F.2d 994, 996 (10th Cir. 1991); *see also* Rucks v. Boergermann, 57 F.3d 978, 979 (10th Cir. 1995). ACCORDINGLY, plaintiff's renewed motion for appointment of counsel [Docket No. 33] is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 9th day of February, 2009.

  
Frank H. Seay  
United States District Judge